

Hitoshi YAMAMOTO et al., S.N. 10/816,063  
Page 19

Dkt. 2271/71538

**REMARKS**

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 21, 2005. Claims 1-75 were pending, with claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72 being in independent form. By this Amendment, new dependent claims 76 and 77 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-77 are pending, with claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72 being in independent form.

The disclosure was objected to as having informalities therein. By this Amendment, the specification has been amended to correct the informality therein. Withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 13, 15, 23, 24, 26, 34, 35, 37, 44, 45, 47, 54, 55 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly anticipated with U.S. Patent No. 5,920,731 to Pletl et al. Claims 3, 5, 14, 16, 25, 27, 36, 38, 46, 48, 56 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pletl in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,898,766 to Mowery et al. Claims 6-9, 11, 17-20, 22, 28-31, 33, 39-43, 49-53 and 59-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pletl in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,496 to MacLaren et al. Claims 64-66, 68-70 and 72-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pletl in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112567 A1 (Sun).

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

This application relates to techniques for controlling different types of PC cards used for a personal computer, for example, without changing a control program of the host computer. Mobile terminal devices and personal computers (such as notebook and laptop computers)

Hitoshi YAMAMOTO et al., S.N. 10/816,063  
Page 20

Dkt. 2271/71538

typically include a PC card control apparatus which is compliant with the PCMCIA (Personal Computer Memory Card International Association) standard. However, more recently, mobile terminal devices have been downsized, and a new PC card employing an efficient bus interface such as USB2.0 and PCIexpress has been produced. The conventional PC card control apparatus configured for connecting a PC card compliant with the PCMCIA standard cannot interface with the new PC card compliant with USB2.0 and/or PCIexpress.

This application provides an improved PC card control apparatus to which a PC card compliant with specific card standards (such as PCMCIA) as well as a PC card compliant with a different card standard can connect.

For example, independent claim 1 is directed to a PC card control apparatus comprising a PC card connector, a card detector and an interconnection switching circuit. The PC card connector provides connections for connecting one of a first PC card compliant with specific card standards and a card-adapting card for connecting a second PC card compliant with a different card standard to the PC card control apparatus. The card detector detects connection of the card-adapting card to the PC card control apparatus and to subsequently output a detection signal. The interconnection switching circuit switches the connections of the PC card connector to connect the PC card connector to a bus interface dedicated to the second card upon receiving the detection signal from the card detector.

Plet1, as understood by Applicant, is directed to devices and methods for connecting a PC card which is compliant to the PCMCIA standard (PC-card 101 in Figs. 1 and 2 of Plet1) to a PCMCIA-conforming host device (such as host computer 100 in Fig. 1 of Plet1) as well as to a non-conforming host device (such as host 200 in Fig. 2 of Plet1). The host 200 in Plet1 can be a charger or an adaptor for connecting the PCMCIA-type PC card to a computer having a RS-232

Hitoshi YAMAMOTO et al., S.N. 10/816,063  
Page 21

Dkt. 2271/71538

interface but not a PCMCIA-type interface

Pletl is not directed to the problem that some PC cards may be compliant with a different card standard (such as USB2.0 and PCIexpress) and not compliant with a specific prevailing card standard (such as PCMCIA or PC CRAD 95). The PC card to be connected to the host in Pletl, in each instance, is PCMCIA-compliant.

Applicant does not find teaching or suggestion in Pletl of a PC card control apparatus wherein a PC card connector provides connections for connecting one of a first PC card compliant with specific card standards and a card-adapting card for connecting a second PC card compliant with a different card standard to the PC card control apparatus, as provided by claim 1 of the present application.

Mowery, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a common internal communications bus for an integrated circuit.

MacLaren, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a computer expansion slot (which enables the computer system to accommodate additional peripheral devices) and associated logic for detecting compatibility with an expansion card.

Sun, as understood by Applicant, is directed to the problem of chip damage in a video card caused by excessive voltage.

Mowery, MacLaren and Sun, like Pletl, are not directed to the problem that some PC cards may be compliant with a different card standard and not compliant with a specific prevailing card standard.

Applicant simply does not find disclosure or suggestion in the cited art, however, of a PC card control apparatus wherein a PC card connector provides connections for connecting one of a first PC card compliant with specific card standards and a card-adapting card for connecting a

Hitoshi YAMAMOTO et al., S.N. 10/816,063  
Page 22

Dkt. 2271/71538

second PC card compliant with a different card standard to the PC card control apparatus, as provided by claim 1 of the present application. Independent claims 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.


The Office Action indicates that claims 10, 21, 32, 67, 71 and 75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, 54, 64, 68 and 72 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art, no changes to the form of claims 10, 21, 32, 67, 71 and 75 are believed to be necessary.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant maintains that the application is allowable, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicant  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400